Long-term Visual and Refractive Outcomes After LASIK for High Myopia and Astigmatism From −8.00 to −14.25 D

Reinstein, DZ., Carp, GI., Archer, TJ., Lewis, TA., Gobbe, M., Moore, J., & Moore, T. (2016). Long-term Visual and Refractive Outcomes After LASIK for High Myopia and Astigmatism From −8.00 to −14.25 D. *Journal of Refractive Surgery*, *32*(5), 290-297. https://doi.org/10.3928/1081597X-20160310-01

Link to publication record in Ulster University Research Portal

Published in:
Journal of Refractive Surgery

Publication Status:
Published online: 11/05/2016

DOI:
10.3928/1081597X-20160310-01

Document Version
Author Accepted version

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via Ulster University's Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Ulster University's institutional repository that provides access to Ulster's research outputs. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact pure-support@ulster.ac.uk.

Download date: 05/05/2023

Efficacy, Safety, Contrast Sensitivity, Aberration Control and 2 year stability after LASIK for high myopia and astigmatism from -8.00 to -14.25 D

Dan Z Reinstein, MD MA(Cantab) FRCSC DABO FRCOphth FEBO[1,2,3,4]
Glenn I Carp, MBBCh, FC Ophth (SA)[1]
Timothy J Archer, MA(Oxon), DipCompSci(Cantab)[1,4]
Tariq A Lewis, MSci ARCS OMT[1]
Marine Gobbe, MSTOptom, PhD[1]
Johnny Moore FRCOphth, PhD, MD[4]
Tara Moore BSc, PhD[4]

1. London Vision Clinic, London, UK
2. Department of Ophthalmology, Columbia University Medical Center, NY, USA
3. Centre Hospitalier National d'Ophtalmologie, Paris, France
4. Biomedical Science Research Institute, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland

Financial Disclosure: Dr Reinstein is a consultant for Carl Zeiss Meditec (Carl Zeiss Meditec AG, Jena, Germany) and has a proprietary interest in the Artemis technology (ArcScan Inc, Morrison, Colorado) through patents administered by the Center for Technology Licensing at Cornell University (CTL), Ithaca, New York. The remaining authors have no proprietary or financial interest in the materials presented herein.

Mr Timothy J Archer is joint first author, as part of his PhD with the University of Ulster.

Correspondence: Dan Z Reinstein, MD MA(Cantab) FRCSC DABO FRCOphth FEBO, London Vision Clinic, 138 Harley Street, London W1G 7LA, United Kingdom. Tel +44 207 224 1005, Fax +44 207 224 1055, email dzr@londonvisionclinic.com

Abstract

Purpose: To evaluate outcomes of high myopic LASIK using the MEL 80 excimer laser.

Methods: Retrospective analysis of 479 consecutive high myopic LASIK procedures (318 patients) using the MEL 80 excimer laser (Carl Zeiss Meditec) and VisuMax femtosecond laser (Carl Zeiss Meditec) in 77% of cases or zero compression Hansatome (Bausch & Lomb) microkeratome in 23% of cases. Inclusion criteria were preoperative spherical equivalent refraction (SEQ) of between -8.00 D to -14.25 D, and CDVA of 20/20 or better. Patients were followed for a minimum of 1 year. Flap thickness was between 80-160 µm and optical zone was between 5.75-6.50 mm. Standard outcomes analysis was performed.

Results: Mean attempted SEQ was -9.39±1.22 D (-8.00 D to -14.18 D) and mean cylinder was -1.03±0.84 D (0.00 D to -4.50 D). Mean age was 37±9 (21 to 60) with 54% female patients. Of this population 69% were treated by DZR and 31% by GIC. Postoperative SEQ was ±0.50 D in 55% and ±1.00 D in 83% of eyes, after primary treatment. After retreatment, 69% of eyes were ±0.50 D and 95% were within ±1.00 D. UDVA was 20/20 or better in 89% of eyes after final treatment. One line of CDVA was lost in 3% of eyes and no eyes lost two or more lines. Statistically significant increases ($p<0.001$) were measured in contrast sensitivity (CSV-1000) at 12 and 18 CPD.

Conclusions: The MEL 80 excimer laser was found to achieve high efficacy and safety for treatment of high myopia between -8.00 D and -14.25 D and up to -4.50 D of cylinder.

Introduction

In the 1990s many studies were published reporting PRK and LASIK correction of very high myopia (up to -32.00 D in some cases),[1-6] however, these treatments were associated with low predictability, significant regression, and induced night vision disturbances.[7-9] During this period, it was found that these issues were in large part due to the use of small optical zones,[10, 11] and the non-aspheric Munnerlyn ablation profiles leading to significant induction of spherical aberration.[12] By 1998, authors concluded that LASIK was not an appropriate treatment for very high myopia above -15.00 D[6] and were suggesting that phakic intraocular lens (IOL) implantation was more appropriate. Over the next 10 years, consensus shifted towards using phakic IOLs for high myopia and published LASIK studies rarely included myopia above -10.00 D. For example, the German Commission for Refractive Surgery's guidelines state that laser correction should only be considered up to -8.00 D.[13]

This thinking was further reinforced when a Cochrane review was published in 2010[14] (and updated in 2014[15]), which compared laser refractive surgery and phakic IOLs for the treatment of high myopia. This review concluded that "at one year post surgery, phakic IOLs are safer than excimer laser surgical correction for moderate to high myopia in the range of -6.00 to -20.00 D and phakic IOLs are preferred by patients". However, by applying the rigorous Cochrane method, only three studies met the inclusion condition of being a randomized control trial (RCT), so the conclusion was based on a total of 114 eyes each for LASIK and phakic IOL. Furthermore, the LASIK studies were for first and second generation excimer lasers, two published in 2002 and one in 2007, in which smaller optical zones and/or non-aspheric ablation profiles had been used.[16-18] Therefore, this review had not considered modern flying spot excimer lasers, advances in eye-tracking, and ablation profile design including the use of larger optical zones, wavefront-optimized aspheric profiles,[19, 20] modern algorithms for compensation for fluence projection and reflection errors,[21] biomechanical factors[22] and the availability of topography-guided ablation profiles.[23] Advances in femtosecond laser technology also allow ultra-thin flaps,[24] thereby preserving stromal tissue and reducing the risk of ectasia.

The comparison should also have been considered in the context of safety. The main risks for high myopic LASIK are inducing night vision disturbances or keratectasia.[25-28] However, phakic IOLs can also cause night vision disturbances,[29] and also introduce less common but potentially serious

complications associated with intraocular surgery such as malignant glaucoma, sub-capsular cataract, damage to zonules, macular edema, suprachoroidal hemorrhage, retinal detachment and endophthalmitis.[29-31] Each type of lens also has specific complications that may require intraocular surgical intervention (over/undersized lens requiring exchange, explantation, cataract, rotation). Anterior chamber lenses can cause chronic endothelial cell loss[31-33] with an incidence of 0.8% in one study,[33] although another study showed no change in endothelial cell count over 10 years, but concluded this might be related to surgeon expertise.[34] Cataract formation in posterior chamber lenses has been reported to occur in 8.48% of myopic eyes, requiring lens explantation in 3.4% of all eyes.[30]

The aim of our study was to report outcomes for a large high myopic LASIK population using the MEL 80 excimer laser (Carl Zeiss Meditec, Jena, Germany). We also set out to compare other methods for high myopia correction with respect to safety and efficacy.

Methods

Patients

This was a retrospective case series of consecutive high myopic LASIK procedures by two experienced surgeons (DZR & GIC) using the MEL 80 excimer laser and VisuMax femtosecond laser (both Carl Zeiss Meditec) or zero compression Hansatome microkeratome (Bausch & Lomb) at the London Vision Clinic, London, UK. Inclusion criteria were attempted spherical equivalent refraction correction of -8.00 D or higher for the primary procedure, medically suitable for LASIK, no signs of keratoconus, no previous ocular, eyelid or orbital surgery, no visually significant cataract, and corrected distance visual acuity (CDVA) 20/20 or better. A minimum follow-up of 1 year was applied. Informed consent and permission to use their data for analysis and publication was obtained from each patient prior to surgery as part of our routine preoperative protocol.

A full ophthalmologic examination was performed before surgery by an in-house optometrist, as has been described previously.[19] Manifest refraction was performed using a standardized and validated protocol.[35] The manifest refraction was repeated on or before the day of surgery by the surgeon, which was used for treatment planning. Laser data entry was calculated using a multivariate regression derived nomogram including sphere, spherical aberration precompensation level (see below), cylinder, age, and flap thickness.

Planning

In our protocol for treating high myopia, the predicted residual stromal thickness (RST) must be greater than 250 μm. For some eyes, this meant planning the treatment to be performed in two stages, so that the RST available for further correction could be accurately assessed before planning the second procedure. RST was calculated including safety biases for corneal thickness, flap thickness and ablation depth.[36] The minimum of 10 central handheld ultrasound pachymetry measurements was used, less a further 15 μm to allow for the mean overestimation based on our comparison to Artemis very high-frequency digital (VHF) ultrasound (Personal communication, Dan Z Reinstein, 01/09/2006). For flaps created with the zero compression Hansatome using the 160 μm head, we had previously measured our mean central flap thickness to be 119±13 μm.[37] By using a 160 μm flap thickness in the safety calculation, this incorporated a safety bias of 41 μm, meaning that

the achieved central flap thickness would be thicker than 160 μm in only 0.8% of eyes. Similarly, a bias of 18 μm was added to the programmed VisuMax flap thickness, based on our previous study that found the mean central flap thickness to be 2 μm thicker than programmed with a standard deviation of 7.9 μm.[38] Finally, ablation depth was adjusted according to our previous study which found the MEL 80 ablation depth readout overestimated achieved ablation depth by approximately 20%,[39] plus an additional 5 μm bias. Postoperative keratometry was not included as part of the suitability assessment; this parameter was formerly used because it acts as a surrogate for induced spherical aberration, but we can now measure the spherical aberration directly.

Patients in whom full correction could not be achieved using the above RST calculations, a two-stage protocol was used where the primary procedure was an intentional undercorrection, followed by a retreatment according to the criteria set out below.

All patients were given extra consent forms that described the greater risks associated with treating high myopia by LASIK relative to lower corrections, including discussion of night vision disturbances, and refractive accuracy and stability. If a full correction was not possible or the RST indicated that further treatment would be unlikely, another extra consent form was used to clarify that only one treatment might be possible. The alternative of phakic IOL surgery was explained to all patients and that this would enable a full correction. Patients then decided which option to take after weighing up the relative risks and benefits.

Surgical Protocol

All treatments were performed as bilateral simultaneous LASIK. The Hansatome was used between 08/08/2003 and 23/07/2010 in 23% and the VisuMax between 13/04/2007 and 29/12/2011 in 77% of eyes. The procedure was performed by surgeon DZR in 69% and by surgeon GIC in 31% of eyes. The CRS-Master software platform (Carl Zeiss Meditec, Jena, Germany) was used to generate the ablation profiles (version 1.1 until 08/11/2004, version 1.3 until 01/03/2007, version 2.1.6 until 01/11/2009, version 2.3.0 thereafter).

The standardized surgical technique has been described previously.[40, 41] Both the flap and corneal ablation were centered on the coaxially sighted corneal light reflex (CSCLR),[42] used as the best approximation of the intersection of the visual axis with the cornea.[43]

The ablation profile used the Tissue Saving Ablation (TSA) profile for the correction of sphere and cylinder, but also included a predetermined level of spherical aberration pre-compensation with a Z_4^0 value ranging up to 1.21 µm (6 mm zone equivalent). Optical treatment zone diameter for first (TSA) profiles was 5.75 mm in 7%, 6.00 mm in 87%, 6.25 mm in 3%, and 6.50 mm in 3% of eyes. The spherical aberration component was treated at the same diameter as the base ablation in 30% and at a 7.00 mm diameter in 70% of eyes. In patients with thinner corneas, the optical zone was reduced to less than 6.00 mm in order to maximize the correction, with the patient counselled for greater risk of night vision disturbances. In patients with very large dark pupil diameter, the optical zone was increased if possible according to corneal thickness.

Intended flap thickness was 160 µm in 23% with the Hansatome, and 80-85 µm in 47%, 90-100 µm in 29%, and 110 µm in 2% of eyes using the VisuMax. Flap diameter ring used was 8.5 mm in 14% and 9.5 mm in 9% of eyes using the Hansatome, while flap diameters with the VisuMax were 8.0 mm in 70%, 8.5 mm in 1%, and 8.8 mm in 5% of eyes. For VisuMax flaps, a small (S) contact glass was used for a 8.0 mm flap diameter otherwise a medium (M) contact glass was used. A 5 mm superior hinge was used in all VisuMax cases.

Where a full correction was performed, we included an age dependent target hyperopic spherical refraction for all patients younger than 42 years according to a linear function whereby the target sphere was +0.66 D for a 21 year old decreasing to plano for a 42 year old. Our micro-monovision protocol[19] was used for all patients older than 42 years, where the target sphere is plano for the dominant eye and -1.50 D for the non-dominant eye for the majority of patients.

Postoperative Course and Evaluation

Patients were instructed to instill tobramycin & dexamethasone (Tobradex: Alcon, Fort Worth, TX, USA) and ofloxacin (Exocin: Allergan Ltd, Marlow, UK) four times daily and wear plastic shields for

sleeping during the first week. The surgeon reviewed the patient at day one and measured spherical refraction and uncorrected distance visual acuity (UDVA); if necessary, flap adjustments were performed at the slit-lamp using a surgical spear under topical anesthetic and antibiotic cover. An optometrist examined the patient at one, three, and twelve months and then yearly thereafter. All visits included measurements of monocular and binocular UDVA, manifest refraction, and corrected distance visual acuity (CDVA). Best-spectacle-corrected mesopic contrast sensitivity was performed at the 3 month visit to compare to baseline. ATLAS corneal topography (Carl Zeiss Meditec, Jena, Germany) and WASCA aberrometry (Carl Zeiss Meditec, Jena, Germany) were performed at 3 months, 1 year and 2 years.

Retreatments

Retreatments followed the same protocol full correction and two-stage patients. Retreatments were performed once stability was demonstrated after at least 6 months, defined as no change in sphere and cylinder within ±0.25 D over an interval of at least two months. A topography-guided ablation[23] was used if the patient reported significant night vision disturbances and it was demonstrated that full spectacle correction alone did not improve night vision disturbances whereas spectacles plus one drop of brimonidine 0.5% did improve night vision disturbances.

In the majority of cases (66%), where the predicted RST was less than 275 µm, a VHF digital ultrasound scan was performed to obtain layered pachymetric maps of corneal, epithelial and residual stromal thickness.[44] The RST map was used to identify the thinnest point and applied in the RST safety calculation. The retreatment was planned such that the predicted RST after the retreatment was at least 250 µm at the location of the maximum ablation as well as the location of the minimum RST. Therefore, in some cases, the retreatment was not necessarily a full correction.

Statistical Analysis

Outcome analysis was performed according to the Standard Graphs for Reporting Refractive Surgery.[45] Outcomes were analyzed separately for primary treatment data only, and after the final treatment. Data from the 2 year visit were used for analysis if available, otherwise 1 year data was used. Stability of keratometry was evaluated by calculating the mean simulated keratometry at 3

months, 1 year and 2 years. The change in higher order aberrations was assessed by the change in coma, spherical aberration and higher order RMS, using a 6 mm analysis zone. Student's t-tests were used to calculate the statistical significance of changes in log contrast sensitivity. Microsoft Excel 2010 (Microsoft Corporation, Seattle, WA, USA) was used for data entry and statistical analysis. A p-value <0.05 was defined as statistically significant.

Results

Patient Population

During the study period, 527 eyes were treated and one year data were available for 479 (91% follow-up), for which the last timepoint after the primary procedure was 2 years in 48% (n=230), 1 year in 46% (n=221), and 6 months in 6% (n=27) of eyes. All eyes where the last timepoint after the primary procedure was earlier than 1 year had undergone retreatment at that time. For these eyes, 1 year follow-up after the retreatment were used to analyze the final outcome. Table 1 shows the demographic data for the study population.

Retreatments

The primary procedure was performed as a partial correction (two-stage protocol) in 16% (79/479) of eyes, of which 71% (56/79) have undergone a retreatment. Of the 400 full correction eyes, 16% (64/400) have undergone a retreatment. Including all eyes, 25% (120/479) of eyes have undergone a retreatment, of which 95% (114/120) were performed as a flap lift, 2.5% (3/120) as a PRK procedure, 1.7% (2/120) as a VisuMax LASIK procedure, and 0.8% (1/120) using the VisuMax sidecut only option (to create a flap within the original flap to avoid a zone of epithelial ingrowth scarring). A topography-guided custom ablation profile was used for 8 eyes, which constitutes 1.7% of all 479 eyes treated (6.7% of the 120 retreatments performed), and was used to correct for a decentration in 5 eyes, and to enlarge the optical zone in 3 eyes. The scotopic pupil diameter (mean 6.04 mm, range: 5.34 to 7.10 mm) of this sub-group was not different to that of the population (p=0.282).

Standard Outcomes

Figure 1 shows the outcomes for primary treatments only. Figure 2 shows the final outcomes, including retreatments.

Table 2 shows the normalized contrast sensitivity data preoperatively and after the final treatment. There was no change at 3 and 6 cpd, and small but statistically significant increase at 12 and 18 cpd ($p<0.001$). Table 3 summarizes the ocular aberrations preoperatively and after the primary treatment. Coma and higher order RMS were increased, as well as spherical aberration which increased by an average of 0.49 µm. ATLAS keratometry data showed that the mean keratometry was 38.09±1.65 D (range: 32.85 to 42.75 D, n=374) at 3 months, 38.27±1.46 D (range: 34.57 to 42.51 D, n=297) at 1 year, and 38.36±1.47 D (range: 34.06 to 41.98 D, n=168) at 2 years. For 238 eyes with keratometry data at both 3 and 12 months, the mean change was 0.22±0.43 D (range: -1.72 to 1.67 D, $p<0.01$). For 116 eyes with keratometry data at both 1 and 2 years, the mean change was 0.11±0.33 D (range: -0.88 to 1.43 D, $p<0.01$).

Complications

In the 109 eyes with flaps created using the Hansatome there were no intraoperative complications other than small epithelial defects requiring bandage contact lenses in 3 eyes (2.8%). The appendix details intraoperative complications for VisuMax flaps and postoperative complications in all eyes. Overall, across the 31 eyes that had intraoperative and/or postoperative complications, 1 eye lost 1 line of CDVA and none lost more than 1 line.

Discussion

The present study found the treatment of myopia between -8.00 D and -14.25 D using the MEL 80 excimer laser and either the VisuMax femtosecond laser or zero compression Hansatome microkeratome to be safe and effective. While there was an increase in higher order aberrations, as expected for a high myopic correction, this increase was not excessive as demonstrated by no reduction in contrast sensitivity. Safety in terms of change in CDVA was also excellent with no eyes losing 2 lines, 3% losing one line, and 50% gaining one line. While night vision disturbances were not objectively measured, a topography-guided retreatment was available for any patients reporting significant symptoms, but was only used in 8 eyes (1.7%) demonstrating that few patients experienced visually significant night vision disturbances.

In order to compare the current study to published LASIK and phakic IOL studies, we performed a literature review for studies published within the last five years reporting results of myopia above -8.00 D. The main outcome parameters are shown in Table 4,[16-18, 32, 46-50] as well as the studies included in the Cochrane review. The results of the present study were similar in terms of accuracy, efficacy and safety to those reported in the last five years for both LASIK and phakic IOLs, although the range treated was much higher for phakic IOLs (e.g. up to -23.00 D[50]). Nevertheless, as discussed earlier, intraocular surgery introduces potential, albeit unusual, serious visual complications. While ectasia can occur many years after surgery,[51] with modern keratoconus screening techniques,[52, 53] inclusion of biases for calculating predicted RST, direct measurement of RST before retreatment surgery, and the availability of corneal cross-linking,[54] the risk of ectasia is significantly lower than 10 years ago.

It is important to note that the present study and other recent LASIK studies[46-48] appear to contradict the conclusion from the Cochrane review;[14, 15] these results are significantly better than those of both LASIK and phakic IOLs reported for studies included in the Cochrane review. The predictability ranged from 29% to 57% within ±0.50 D for the LASIK/PRK groups and from 24% to 76% for the phakic IOL groups in the Cochrane review, whereas the range was from 69% to 100% for recent LASIK studies. Similarly, postoperative UDVA was 20/20 or better in 12% to 84% in the LASIK/PRK groups and 20% to 97% in the phakic IOL groups in the Cochrane review, whereas the range was 77% to 92% for recent LASIK studies. Finally, safety was much worse for the LASIK groups in the

Cochrane review with a loss of 2 or more lines of CDVA between 4%[18] and 12% of eyes,[16] whereas no eyes lost even 2 lines in the recent LASIK studies. Therefore, it appears that the Cochrane review[14, 15] only included studies that would be considered out-of-date, and the conclusions while applicable to earlier technology and protocols do not apply to modern LASIK. This demonstrates the limitation of the Cochrane review methodology to refractive surgery, as very few studies meet the strict criteria of being randomized control trials. This is further emphasized by the fact that the 2014[15] update found no new studies meeting the inclusion criteria. While the Cochrane review methodology clearly represents a robust method scientifically, it suffers when applied to refractive surgery as the majority of studies reporting surgical outcomes are retrospective for obvious reasons. This however highlights the paucity of randomized controlled trials, outside of United States Food and Drug Administration trials,[55] as a weakness of the refractive surgery field.

In summary, LASIK for high myopia up to -14.25 D using modern technology was found to have similar outcomes to phakic IOLs, while avoiding the potentially serious complications associated with intraocular surgery.

Legends

Figure 1: Nine standard graphs for reporting refractive surgery showing the visual and refractive outcomes for 479 high myopic eyes after initial treatment with the MEL 80 excimer laser and the VisuMax femtosecond laser (both Carl Zeiss Meditec) or the zero compression Hansatome microkeratome (Bausch & Lomb). UDVA = uncorrected distance visual acuity; CDVA= corrected distance visual acuity; D = diopters; Postop = postoperative; Preop = preoperative; SEQ = spherical equivalent refraction; TIA = target induced astigmatism; SIA = surgically induced astigmatism.

Figure 2: Nine standard graphs for reporting refractive surgery showing the visual and refractive outcomes for 479 high myopic eyes after final treatment with the MEL 80 excimer laser and the VisuMax femtosecond laser (both Carl Zeiss Meditec) or the zero compression Hansatome microkeratome (Bausch & Lomb). UDVA = uncorrected distance visual acuity; CDVA= corrected distance visual acuity; D = diopters; Postop = postoperative; Preop = preoperative; SEQ = spherical equivalent refraction; TIA = target induced astigmatism; SIA = surgically induced astigmatism.

References

1. Knorz MC, Liermann A, Seiberth V, Steiner H, Wiesinger B. Laser in situ keratomileusis to correct myopia of -6.00 to -29.00 diopters. J Refract Surg. 1996;12:575-584.

2. Kim HM, Jung HR. Laser assisted in situ keratomileusis for high myopia. Ophthalmic Surg Lasers. 1996;27:S508-511.

3. Condon PI, Mulhern M, Fulcher T, Foley-Nolan A, O'Keefe M. Laser intrastromal keratomileusis for high myopia and myopic astigmatism. Br J Ophthalmol. 1997;81:199-206.

4. Tsai RJ. Laser in situ keratomileusis for myopia of -2 to -25 diopters. J Refract Surg. 1997;13:S427-429.

5. Marinho A, Pinto MC, Pinto R, Vaz F, Neves MC. LASIK for high myopia: one year experience. Ophthalmic Surg Lasers. 1996;27:S517-520.

6. Knorz MC, Wiesinger B, Liermann A, Seiberth V, Liesenhoff H. Laser in situ keratomileusis for moderate and high myopia and myopic astigmatism. Ophthalmology. 1998;105:932-940.

7. Corbett MC, Verma S, O'Brart DP, Oliver KM, Heacock G, Marshall J. Effect of ablation profile on wound healing and visual performance 1 year after excimer laser photorefractive keratectomy. Br J Ophthalmol. 1996;80:224-234.

8. Gartry DS, Kerr Muir MG, Marshall J. Excimer laser photorefractive keratectomy. 18-month follow-up. Ophthalmology. 1992;99:1209-1219.

9. Chayet AS, Assil KK, Montes M, Espinosa-Lagana M, Castellanos A, Tsioulias G. Regression and its mechanisms after laser in situ keratomileusis in moderate and high myopia. Ophthalmology. 1998;105:1194-1199.

10. O'Brart DP, Corbett MC, Lohmann CP, Kerr Muir MG, Marshall J. The effects of ablation diameter on the outcome of excimer laser photorefractive keratectomy. A prospective, randomized, double-blind study. Arch Ophthalmol. 1995;113:438-443.

11. O'Brart DP, Corbett MC, Verma S, Heacock G, Oliver KM, Lohmann CP, Kerr Muir MG, Marshall J. Effects of ablation diameter, depth, and edge contour on the outcome of photorefractive keratectomy. J Refract Surg. 1996;12:50-60.

12. Seiler T, Genth U, Holschbach A, Derse M. Aspheric photorefractive keratectomy with excimer laser. Refract Corneal Surg. 1993;9:166-172.

13. Kohnen T, Strenger A, Klaproth OK. Basic knowledge of refractive surgery: correction of refractive errors using modern surgical procedures. Dtsch Arztebl Int. 2008;105:163-170; quiz 170-162.
14. Barsam A, Allan BD. Excimer laser refractive surgery versus phakic intraocular lenses for the correction of moderate to high myopia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010:CD007679.
15. Barsam A, Allan BD. Excimer laser refractive surgery versus phakic intraocular lenses for the correction of moderate to high myopia. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2014;6:CD007679.
16. El Danasoury MA, El Maghraby A, Gamali TO. Comparison of iris-fixed Artisan lens implantation with excimer laser in situ keratomileusis in correcting myopia between -9.00 and -19.50 diopters: a randomized study. Ophthalmology. 2002;109:955-964.
17. Schallhorn S, Tanzer D, Sanders DR, Sanders ML. Randomized prospective comparison of visian toric implantable collamer lens and conventional photorefractive keratectomy for moderate to high myopic astigmatism. J Refract Surg. 2007;23:853-867.
18. Malecaze FJ, Hulin H, Bierer P, Fournie P, Grandjean H, Thalamas C, Guell JL. A randomized paired eye comparison of two techniques for treating moderately high myopia: LASIK and artisan phakic lens. Ophthalmology. 2002;109:1622-1630.
19. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. LASIK for Myopic Astigmatism and Presbyopia Using Non-Linear Aspheric Micro-Monovision with the Carl Zeiss Meditec MEL 80 Platform. J Refract Surg. 2011;27:23-37.
20. Srivannaboon S, Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Chansue E. Spherical Aberration from Myopic Excimer Laser Ablation for Aspheric and Non-Aspheric Profiles. Optom Vis Sci. 2012;89:1211-1218.
21. Mrochen M, Seiler T. Influence of corneal curvature on calculation of ablation patterns used in photorefractive laser surgery. J Refract Surg. 2001;17:S584-587.
22. Dupps WJ, Jr., Roberts C. Effect of acute biomechanical changes on corneal curvature after photokeratectomy. J Refract Surg. 2001;17:658-669.
23. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. Combined corneal topography and corneal wavefront data in the treatment of corneal irregularity and refractive error in LASIK or PRK using the Carl Zeiss Meditec MEL80 and CRS Master. J Refract Surg. 2009;25:503-515.

24. Lim DH, Keum JE, Ju WK, Lee JH, Chung TY, Chung ES. Prospective contralateral eye study to compare 80- and 120-mum flap LASIK using the VisuMax femtosecond laser. J Refract Surg. 2013;29:462-468.
25. Randleman JB. Post-laser in-situ keratomileusis ectasia: current understanding and future directions. Curr Opin Ophthalmol. 2006;17:406-412.
26. Randleman JB, Caster AI, Banning CS, Stulting RD. Corneal ectasia after photorefractive keratectomy. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2006;32:1395-1398.
27. Randleman JB, Russell B, Ward MA, Thompson KP, Stulting RD. Risk factors and prognosis for corneal ectasia after LASIK. Ophthalmology. 2003;110:267-275.
28. Malecaze F, Coullet J, Calvas P, Fournie P, Arne JL, Brodaty C. Corneal ectasia after photorefractive keratectomy for low myopia. Ophthalmology. 2006;113:742-746.
29. Phakic intraocular lenses for the treatment of refractive errors: an evidence-based analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser. 2009;9:1-120.
30. Chen LJ, Chang YJ, Kuo JC, Rajagopal R, Azar DT. Metaanalysis of cataract development after phakic intraocular lens surgery. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2008;34:1181-1200.
31. Alio JL, Toffaha BT, Pena-Garcia P, Sadaba LM, Barraquer RI. Phakic intraocular lens explantation: causes in 240 cases. J Refract Surg. 2015;31:30-35.
32. Knorz MC, Lane SS, Holland SP. Angle-supported phakic intraocular lens for correction of moderate to high myopia: Three-year interim results in international multicenter studies. Journal of Cataract & Refractive Surgery. 2011;37:469-480.
33. Guell JL, Morral M, Gris O, Gaytan J, Sisquella M, Manero F. Five-Year Follow-up of 399 Phakic Artisan-Verisyse Implantation for Myopia, Hyperopia, and/or Astigmatism. Ophthalmology. 2007.
34. Tahzib NG, Nuijts RM, Wu WY, Budo CJ. Long-term study of Artisan phakic intraocular lens implantation for the correction of moderate to high myopia: ten-year follow-up results. Ophthalmology. 2007;114:1133-1142.
35. Reinstein DZ, Yap TE, Carp GI, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. Reproducibility of manifest refraction between surgeons and optometrists in a clinical refractive surgery practice. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2014;40:450-459.

405 36. Reinstein DZ, Srivannaboon S, Archer TJ, Silverman RH, Sutton H, Coleman DJ. Probability
406 model of the inaccuracy of residual stromal thickness prediction to reduce the risk of ectasia after
407 LASIK part I: quantifying individual risk. J Refract Surg. 2006;22:851-860.
408 37. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. LASIK flap thickness profile and reproducibility of the
409 standard vs zero compression Hansatome microkeratomes: three-dimensional display with Artemis
410 VHF digital ultrasound. J Refract Surg. 2011;27:417-426.
411 38. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M, Johnson N. Accuracy and Reproducibility of Artemis
412 Central Flap Thickness and Visual Outcomes of LASIK With the Carl Zeiss Meditec VisuMax
413 Femtosecond Laser and MEL 80 Excimer Laser Platforms. J Refract Surg. 2010;26:107-119.
414 39. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. Corneal Ablation Depth Readout of the MEL80 Excimer
415 Laser Compared to Artemis Three-dimensional Very High-frequency Digital Ultrasound Stromal
416 Measurements. J Refract Surg. 2010;26:949-959.
417 40. Reinstein DZ, Carp GI, de Benedictis D, Archer TJ, Gobbe M, Khan R, von Borch M.
418 Standardization of LASIK surgical technique evaluated by comparison of procedure time between two
419 experienced surgeons. J Cataract Refract Surg. 2015;41:1004-1008.
420 41. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ. Real-time bilateral LASIK procedure. Available at:
421 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ncSWnXpgYd0. Accessed 01/12/2014.
422 42. Reinstein DZ, Gobbe M, Archer TJ. Coaxially sighted corneal light reflex versus entrance
423 pupil center centration of moderate to high hyperopic corneal ablations in eyes with small and large
424 angle kappa. J Refract Surg. 2013;29:518-525.
425 43. Pande M, Hillman JS. Optical zone centration in keratorefractive surgery. Entrance pupil
426 center, visual axis, coaxially sighted corneal reflex, or geometric corneal center? Ophthalmology.
427 1993;100:1230-1237.
428 44. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Gobbe M. Comparison of residual stromal bed thickness
429 measurement among very high-frequency digital ultrasound, intraoperative handheld ultrasound, and
430 optical coherence tomography. J Refract Surg. 2012;28:42-47.
431 45. Reinstein DZ, Archer TJ, Randleman JB. JRS Standard for Reporting Astigmatism Outcomes
432 of Refractive Surgery. J Refract Surg. 2014;30:654-659.

433 46. Kanellopoulos AJMD, Asimellis GP. Refractive and Keratometric Stability in High Myopic
434 LASIK With High-Frequency Femtosecond and Excimer Lasers. Journal of Refractive Surgery.
435 2013;29:832-837.
436 47. Stonecipher KGMD, Kezirian GMMD, Stonecipher M. LASIK for -6.00 to -12.00 D of Myopia
437 with up to 3.00 D of Cylinder Using the ALLEGRETTO WAVE: 3- and 6-Month Results with the 200-
438 and 400-Hz Platforms. Journal of Refractive Surgery. 2010;26:S814-818.
439 48. Vega-Estrada AMDM, Alió JLMDP, Mosquera SAM, Moreno LJM. Corneal Higher Order
440 Aberrations After LASIK for High Myopia With a Fast Repetition Rate Excimer Laser, Optimized
441 Ablation Profile, and Femtosecond Laser--assisted Flap. Journal of Refractive Surgery. 2012;28:689-
442 696.
443 49. Hashemi H, Miraftab M, Asgari S. Comparison of the visual outcomes between PRK-MMC
444 and phakic IOL implantation in high myopic patients. Eye. 2014.
445 50. Ju Y, Gao X-W, Ren B. Posterior chamber phakic intraocular lens implantation for high
446 myopia. International journal of ophthalmology, 2013:831-835.
447 51. Said A, Hamade IH, Tabbara KF. Late onset corneal ectasia after LASIK surgery. Saudi J
448 Ophthalmol. 2011;25:225-230.
449 52. Ambrosio R, Jr., Caiado AL, Guerra FP, Louzada R, Roy AS, Luz A, Dupps WJ, Belin MW.
450 Novel pachymetric parameters based on corneal tomography for diagnosing keratoconus. J Refract
451 Surg. 2011;27:753-758.
452 53. Silverman RH, Urs R, Roychoudhury A, Archer TJ, Gobbe M, Reinstein DZ. Epithelial
453 remodeling as basis for machine-based identification of keratoconus. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci.
454 2014;55:1580-1587.
455 54. Wollensak G, Spoerl E, Seiler T. Riboflavin/ultraviolet-a-induced collagen crosslinking for the
456 treatment of keratoconus. Am J Ophthalmol. 2003;135:620-627.
457 55. FDA. WaveLight ALLEGRETTO WAVE™ Excimer Laser System (PMA). Available at:
458 http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh_docs/pdf3/P030008b.pdf. Accessed 11/07/2014.

459

Intraoperative complications

	Occurrences	Percentage of Total
Epithelial Defect	8	2.2%
Suction Loss	7	1.9%
Incomplete Flap (Edge)	2	0.5%
Incomplete Flap (Ablation Zone)	1	0.3%
Buttonhole	4	1.1%
Free Cap	0	0%
Irregular Bed	0	0%
Flap Tear	1	0.3%

Postoperative complications requiring flap lift

	Occurrences	Percentage of Total
Flap Lift for Trauma	1	0.3%
Flap Lift for Epithelial Ingrowth	2	0.5%
Flap Lift for Microfolds	1	0.3%
Flap Lift for Interface Deposits	1	0.3%

Intraoperative Complications

Hansatome treated eyes: There were no intraoperative complications in the 109 eyes treated using the Hansatome microkeratome other than a small epithelial defect requiring a bandage contact lens in 3 eyes (2.8%). There was no impact on CDVA in any of these cases.

VisuMax treated eyes: Of the 371 eyes treated using the VisuMax femtosecond laser, a peripheral epithelial defect requiring a bandage contact lens occurred in 8 eyes (2.2%). Suction loss occurred in 7 eyes (1.9%), 5 eyes in which the contact glass was immediately reapplied and flap creation completed with the same flap parameters; of these, a perfect flap was created in 4 eyes with the stromal bed appearing smooth prior to ablation. In the remaining eye some thin thread-like mid-peripheral stromal slivers were noted on the stromal bed with the central bed of good quality for ablation; the peripheral stromal slivers were repositioned before the excimer laser ablation was performed and the flap was repositioned perfectly with no subsequent loss of best spectacle corrected vision or contrast sensitivity. The remaining 2 eyes with repeated suction loss belonged to the same patient, where after four attempts on the first eye and one attempt on the second eye it was deemed

not possible to adequately create flaps using the VisuMax. After discussion with the patient, the procedures were performed instead using the zero compression Hansatome microkeratome without further complication. In all 8 eyes that experienced a suction loss, there was no loss of CDVA nor contrast sensitivity, and 7 eyes actually experienced a gain of one line of CDVA. Further recorded complications in VisuMax treated eyes included one eye (0.3%) with a small tear to the hinge of the flap in an eye that subsequently gained two lines of CDVA; a small peripheral flap tear approximately 1 mm within the flap boundary inferiorly in one eye (0.3%) where the flap lifting instrument perforated the flap while manually dissecting through a peripheral zone of dense opaque bubble layer (OBL) due to the presence of a small cryptic buttonhole in an 80 (programmed 98) μm flap – after ablation the flap was repositioned perfectly, a bandage contact lens was applied and after healing there was no change in CDVA. There were 3 eyes (0.8%) in which there was inadequate or no femtosecond cutting within a small area of flap interface (centrally in 1 eye, peripherally in 2 eyes); in each case these areas could be dissected manually and there was no impact on CDVA or contrast sensitivity. Finally, there were 4 eyes (1.1%) in which a small buttonhole was discovered on lifting the flap (centrally in 1 eye, peripherally in 3 eyes) probably secondary to previous focal contact lens related infections (with epithelial plugs). In all cases, after carefully lifting the flap, the residual epithelium overlying Bowman's layer was brushed off to reveal the stromal surface and the ablation was performed and flap replaced carefully followed by an overnight bandage contact lens. The eye with a central buttonhole lost one line of CDVA.

Postoperative complications requiring flap lift

A flap lift procedure was required at the 1 day visit to reposition the flap in 1 eye (0.3%) following a flap slip due to trauma to the eye overnight. This eye then also required a second flap lift procedure 1 week later for epithelial ingrowth removal which healed with no ingrowth. One other eye (0.3%) required a flap lift procedure for epithelial ingrowth following a retreatment procedure. A flap lift procedure was performed for 1 eye (0.3%) to treat microfolds at the 1 month timepoint. A flap lift procedure was performed for 1 eye (0.3%) to remove inorganic deposits from the flap interface. There was no impact on CDVA in any of these cases.

Table 1: Study demographics

Number of Eyes (patients)	479 (318)
Age (years)	37±9 (21 to 60)
Gender Ratio (M/F %)	46 / 54
Attempted Spherical Equivalent Refraction (D)	-9.39±1.22 (-8.00 to -14.18)
Attempted Cylinder (D)	-1.03±0.84 (0.00 to -4.50)
Scotopic pupil (mm)	5.80±1.04 (3.36 to 8.40)

Table 2: Normalized mesopic contrast sensitivity (CSV-1000)

	3 CPD	6 CPD	12 CPD	18 CPD
Pre	0.99±0.11	0.94±0.09	0.91±0.13	0.84±0.19
Post	0.98±0.11	0.94±0.09	0.93±0.13	0.87±0.20
p-value	0.127	0.249	<0.001	<0.001

CPD: Cycles Per Degree

Table 3: Ocular Aberrations (µm)

	Pre	Post	Change	t-test
Coma	0.169±0.103	0.266±0.201	0.100±0.221	p<0.001
Spherical Aberration	0.135±0.148	0.626±0.222	0.491±0.074	p<0.001
HORMS	0.324±0.109	0.737±0.198	0.426±0.196	p<0.001

HORMS: High Order Root Mean Square

						Accuracy			UDVA			Safety	
First Author	N (eyes)	Technique	Preop SEQ (D)	Age (years)	FU	Mean±SD (D) (range)	±0.50	±1.00	Pre CDVA ≤20/20	≤20/20	≤20/40	1 line	≥2 lines
Reinstein 2014	483	LASIK VisuMax/Hansatome CZM MEL80	-9.57±1.29 (-7.50 to -14.18)	36.8±9.4 (21 to 60)	1-2 years	-0.26±0.47 (-2.25 to +1.13)	69%	95%	100%	89%	99%	3%	0%
Kanellopoulos 2013	116	LASIK Wavelight FS200 Wavelight EX500	-7.67±1.55 (-6.00 to -13.00)	28.7 ± 7.5 (17 to 51)	3 months	-0.37±0.08	89%	95%	73%	90.5%	97.4%	1.7%	0%
Vega-Estrada 2012	29	LASIK IntraLase Schwind AMARIS	-8.39±0.93 (-6.75 to -11.25)	36.7 ±10.8 (24 to 61)	6 months	-0.42±0.82 (-3.50 to +0.63)	-	89.6%	-	-	-	-	-
Stonecipher 2010	65	LASIK IntraLase Alcon Allegretto Wave 400Hz	-7.07±0.89 (-6.86 to -12.63)	33.8 (20 to 60)	6 months	-	100%	100%	-	92%	100%	-	0%
Stonecipher 2010	141	LASIK IntraLase Alcon Allegretto Wave 200Hz	-6.76±1.01 (-6.08 to -11.05)	33.8 (20 to 60)	6 months	-	86%	100%	-	77%	100%	-	0%
Hashemi 2014	23	PRK-MMC VISX STAR S4	-8.82±1.25 (≤ -8.00)	28.7±5.3	1 year	-0.25±0.41	85.7%	-	76.2%	57.1%	-	9.5%	0%
Hashemi 2014	23	Phakic IOL Artiflex	-9.49±1.94 (≤ -8.00)	27.7±5.3	1 year	-0.17±1.17	95.7%	-	95.7%	73.9%	-	0%	0%
Ju 2013	82	Phakic IOL STAAR ICL	-15.56±4.35 (-9.00 to -23.00)	28.6 ± 7.6 (19 to 45)	3 months	-1.85±0.72	72.5%	88%	45%	58.5%	92.7%	3.7%	-
Knorz 2011	104	Phakic IOL AcrySof Cachet	-10.41±2.31 (-6.00 to -16.50)	36.6 ± 8.1 (18 to 53)	3 years	-0.24±0.55 (-2.00 to +1.63)	78.8%	91.3%	100%	71.2%	98.1%	1%	1%
Alió 2014	40	LASIK VISX 20/20	(-6.00 to -18.00)	51.1±6.7 (35 to 60)	15 years	-1.37±2.21	-	46.2%	-	43.6%	64.1%	10.3%	0%
Oruçoğlu 2012	143 39 FU	LASIK Technolas	-21.70±5.80 (-38.00 to -14.13)	-	10 years	-6.09±3.35 (-14.38 to -0.50)	-	14% 1 year	-	-	2.6%	10.3%	-
El Danasoury 2002	45	LASIK NIDEK EC-5000	-13.24±2.30 (-9.13 to -17.50)	33.7±7.1 (21 to 47)	1 year	-0.87±0.8 (-3.00 to -1.00)	29%	56%	-	12.2%	58.5%	-	12.2%
El Danasoury 2002	45	Phakic IOL Artisan	-13.93±2.90 (-9.50 to -19.38)	33.7±7.1 (21 to 47)	1 year	-0.64±0.8	42%	65%	-	20.9%	88.4%	-	0%
Malecaze 2002	25	LASIK Hansatome Technolas	-9.39±1.47 (-8.00 to -12.00)	38.4±7.6 (31 to 52)	1 year	-0.74±0.67	44%	64%	-	24%	80%	20%	4%

Malecaze 2002	25	Phakic IOL Artisan	-10.19±1.56 (-8.00 to -12.00)	38.4±7.6 (31 to 52)	1 year	-0.95±0.45	24%	60%	-	20%	60%	12%	0%
Schallhorn 2007	45	PRK VISX S3	-8.30±1.25	32.6±7.0	1 year	+0.60±0.75	57%	80%	89%	82%	-	7%	0%
Schallhorn 2007	43	Phakic IOL TICL	-8.04±1.28	30.8±6.0	1 year	+0.27±0.36	76%	100%	93%	97%	-	0%	0%



Uncorrected Distance Visual Acuity



Uncorrected Distance Visual Acuity vs. Corrected Distance Visual Acuity



Change in Corrected Distance Visual Acuity



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Attempted vs Achieved



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Accuracy



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Stability



Refractive Astigmatism



Target Induced Astigmatism vs Surgically Induced Astigmatism



Refractive Astigmatism Angle of Error



Uncorrected Distance Visual Acuity



Uncorrected Distance Visual Acuity vs. Corrected Distance Visual Acuity



Change in Corrected Distance Visual Acuity



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Attempted vs Achieved



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Accuracy



Spherical Equivalent Refraction Stability



Refractive Astigmatism



Target Induced Astigmatism vs Surgically Induced Astigmatism



Refractive Astigmatism Angle of Error